UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,176	07/11/2001	Hawley K. Rising III	020699-002400US	1173

20350 7590 03/12/2004

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
AL HASHEMI, SANA A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	5

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/904,176	RISING ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sana Al-Hashemi	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 July 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 January 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status: 10-32 rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 9-18, 22-27, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ronning (Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0212992).

1. Regarding Claim 1, Ronning discloses a method for executing a group of commands on a content description structure, the content description structure including a plurality of relationally related nodes, in a computing environment comprising the steps of.

determining a dependency between commands in the group of commands based on the relationally related plurality of nodes (see paragraph 0038, Ronning);

assigning one or more attribute tags to the group of commands, wherein assigning one or more attribute tags comprises if commands in the group of commands are determined to be dependent, assigning a sequential tag to the group of commands and if

commands in the group of commands are determined to be independent, assigning a parallel tag to the group of commands (see paragraph 0066, Ronning[1]);

executing the group of commands according to the one or more attribute tags wherein executing the group of commands comprises if the group of commands was assigned the sequential tag, executing commands in the group of commands in sequence and if the group of commands was assigned the parallel tag, executing commands in the group of commands in parallel (see Fig. 5b, 560, 562, paragraph 0067, Ronning).

2. Regarding Claims 2, Ronning discloses a method wherein assigning one or more attribute tags to

the group of commands comprises assigning a start time tag to the group of commands (see paragraph 0067, Ronning).

3. Regarding Claim 3, Ronning discloses a method wherein executing the group of commands

according to the one or more attribute tags comprises executing the group of commands at the start time (see paragraph 0072, Ronning).

4. Regarding Claim 4, Ronning discloses a method wherein assigning one or more attribute tags to

the group of commands comprises assigning a duration time to the group of commands (see Fig. 15, 742, 745, Ronning).

5. Regarding Claim 5, Ronning discloses a method wherein executing the group of commands according to the one or more attribute tags comprises executing the group of

[1] The method of selecting a product reads on tagging the product.

commands during a time period starting at the start time and lasting until the start time plus the duration time (see paragraph 0081, Ronning).

Regarding Claim 9, Ronning discloses a method wherein assigning one or more attribute tags to the group of commands comprises assigning a result tag to a group of commands (see Fig. 5b, 562, 566, Ronning).

6. Regarding Claim 10, Ronning discloses a method further comprising saving a result of the execution of the group of commands in a new file (see paragraph 0077, Ronning).

7. Regarding Claim 11, Ronning discloses a method wherein assigning one or more attribute tags to the group of commands comprises assigning a write tag to a group of commands, wherein the write tag designates the new file (see paragraph 0091, Ronning).

8. Regarding Claim 12, Ronning discloses a method further comprising overwriting an existing file with a result of the execution of the group of commands (see paragraph 0084, Ronning [2]).

9. Regarding Claim 13, Ronning discloses a method wherein executing the group of commands comprises executing adding, editing, and deleting commands on the content description structure (see paragraph 0082, Ronning).

10. Regarding Claims 14, and 31, Ronning discloses a system for executing commands in a computing environment comprising:

a content description structure, wherein the content description structure includes a plurality of relationally related nodes (see paragraph 0038, Ronning);

[2] The step of updating corresponds to overwriting.

a group of commands, wherein commands in the group of commands have a dependency based on the relationally related nodes one or more attribute tags, wherein the one or more attribute tags comprise a sequential tag and parallel tag (see paragraph 0066, Ronning[3]);

an encoder system comprising logic to encode a group of commands in the one or more groups of commands with the one or more attribute tags, wherein the group of commands is encoded with the sequential tag if the dependency of the group of commands is dependent indicating the group of commands are to be executed in sequence and the group of commands is encoded with the parallel tag if the dependency of the group of commands is independent and indicates the group of commands are to be executed in parallel (se paragraph 0090, Ronning); and

a decoder system comprising logic to execute the encoded group of commands according to the one or more attribute tags, wherein the group of commands encoded with the sequential tag are executed in sequence and the group of commands encoded with the parallel tag are executed in parallel (see Fig. 5b, 560, 562, paragraph 0067, Ronning).

11. Regarding Claim 15, Ronning discloses a system wherein the one or more attribute tags comprise a start time tag, wherein the start time tag comprises a start time value (see paragraph 0072, Ronning).

12. Regarding Claim 16, Ronning discloses a system wherein the encoder system encodes the group of commands with the start time tag, wherein the decoder system executes the group of commands at the start time value (see paragraph 0072, Ronning).

---

[3] The method of selecting a product reads on tagging the product.

13. Regarding Claim 17, Ronning discloses a system wherein the one or more attribute tags comprise a duration tag, wherein the duration tag comprises a duration value (see paragraph 0081, Ronning).

14. Regarding Claim 18, Ronning discloses a system wherein the encoder system encodes the group of commands with the duration tag, wherein the decoder system executes the group of commands during a time period defined by the start time value and the start time value plus the duration value (see Fig. 15, 742, 745, Ronning).

15. Regarding Claim 23, and 28, Ronning discloses a system wherein the one or more attribute tags comprise a result tag, wherein the result tag comprises a new file value and overwrite value (see paragraph 0084, Ronning [4]).

16. Regarding Claim 24, Ronning discloses a system wherein the encoder system encodes the group of commands with the result tag (see paragraph 0079, Ronning).

17. Regarding Claim 25, Ronning discloses a system wherein the decoder system saves a result of the executed group of commands in a new file if the result tag has the new file value (see paragraph 0077, Ronning).

18. Regarding Claims 29, and 30, Ronning discloses a system wherein the content description structure is a tree structure (see Fig. 13, 734, Ronning [5]).

---

[4] The step of updating corresponds to overwriting.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. (a) as being unpatentable over Ronning (Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0212992).

19. Regarding Claim 6-8, and 19-21, Ronning does not explicitly disclose a method wherein assigning one or more attribute tags to the group of commands comprises assigning an authority tag to the group of commands. However, Examiner takes official notice that's it's well known in the art to provide users with different level of authority, in order to restrict prohibited users from accessing certain type of data for (i.e. security reasons). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify/ add the level of authority to each user wit the motivation of restrict prohibited users from accessing certain type of data for (i.e. security or fraud reasons) which will make the system more reliable to users and that's will increase the number of users using the system.

---

[5] All drop down menus are tree structured.

Claims 26, 27, 31, and 32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Ronning (Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0212992) in view of Tabatabai et al. (Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0085028).

20. Regarding Claims 26, 27, and 31, Ronning discloses all of the claimed subject matter as set forth above except he does not teach the usage of XML, XSD, nor MPEG. However, Tabatabai teaches the use of XML, XSD (see paragraph 0033, Tabatabai) and MPEG (see paragraph 0025). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the XML, XSD, and MPEG as taught by Tabatabai in Ronning because XML, XSD, and MPEG improve WWW performance.

21. Regarding Claim 32, the combination of Ronning in view of Tabatabai discloses schema further comprising an execution validity attribute, wherein the execution validity attribute comprising a start time that indicates a start time for valid execution of the group of commands and a duration time attribute that indication a duration for valid execution of the group of commands (see Fig. 2, 420, Tabatabai).

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to: Sana Al-Hashemi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4881. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436. Any response to this office action should be mailed to: The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. Or telefax at phone number (703) 782-9306. For formal or draft communications, please label "PROSPOSED" or "DRAFT". Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, 6th Floor Receptionist, Arlington, Virginia. 22202.

Sana Al-Hashemi
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
March 3, 2004

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100